



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Synopses of Important Articles.

THE DIFFICULT WORDS OF CHRIST. III. THINGS OLD AND NEW. By
REV. JAMES STALKER, D.D., in *The Expositor* for July, 1893.

The passage considered is found in Matt. 13:52. The name which our Lord employs for Christian teachers is noteworthy; he calls them scribes — “every scribe who is instructed unto the kingdom of heaven.” The “scribes,” in the New Testament, and especially in Christ’s own history, occupy a sinister position, and theirs is an evil name. However, their occupation was with the Word of God, and in this respect analogous to that of the teachers and preachers in the new order of things which Christ came to found. The “scribes” failed in their duty. They misused the Scriptures. Those who were instructed so as to be of use in forwarding Christianity must so use the Word as Christ himself had used it.

The equipment of the Christian teacher is called a “treasure.” It is not the Bible, nor anything outside himself; it is within him. It is a storehouse or magazine in the mind, which he has filled with spiritual accumulations. Some of these are obtained from Scripture by personal study and appropriation of its teachings. Some are derived from personal religious experiences, and some consist of acquaintance with the experiences of others. Hence it appears how enormously the treasures of different Christian teachers differ from one another; both in quality and quantity. This treasure is to be emptied out again for the good of the world and our Lord indicates how this is to be done in the words — “bringeth out of his treasure things new and old.” The common interpretation which takes this phrase to recommend a pleasing variety in Christian teaching is entirely beneath the height and dignity of Christ’s teaching. The connection shows that Jesus had been teaching many things in parables, and that he commends its use to his disciples also. “Things new and old” is a characterization of his own method of parabolic teaching. If we understand by the old the well known and familiar, and by the new the unknown or unfamiliar, a parable may be defined to be a familiar incident setting forth an unfamiliar truth. The old and the new are not, therefore, to be brought out of the treasure apart — sometimes one and sometimes the other — but they are to be brought forth together, in such a way that what is already well-known and familiar may become the stepping-stone to ascend to what is novel and recondite.

This interpretation of “things new and old” lays the emphasis on the mode of teaching rather than on the contents, on the pictorial illustrations of truth rather than

on the truth to be illustrated. Illustration, whether by parable or otherwise, is no doubt a valuable adjunct in presenting spiritual truth; but to understand our Lord as referring wholly or even chiefly to this seems "entirely beneath the height and dignity" of his words. The truth, whether new or old, is the essential thing; the mode in which it is presented is altogether subordinate and incidental,

P. A. N.

ST. PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY. VII. THE DOCTRINE OF SIN.

By Professor A. B. BRUCE, D.D., in *The Expositor* for July, 1893.

St. Paul's negative doctrine concerning justification, viz., that it is not attainable by the method of legalism, resolves itself practically into the Pauline doctrine of sin, which embraces four particulars:

(1) The statement concerning the general prevalence of sin in the "sin section" of the Epistle to the Romans. This popular argument does not prove that salvation by works is impossible, but that it is very unlikely. Without distinction of Jew or Gentile, it is clear that, whatever might be possible for the exceptional few, the way of legal righteousness could never be the way of salvation for the million. This conclusion, however, the Apostle is not content to rest, either on the appeal to observation nor on citations from the Hebrew Psalter.

(2) The necessary supplement is to be found in the famous passage concerning Adam and Christ (Rom. 5 : 12-21). This vindicates the Apostle's whole doctrine of justification, both on its negative and on its positive side. The religious history of the world is here summed up under two representative men. Between these two St. Paul draws a parallel in so far as both by their action influenced their whole race. It may be said that the Apostle here supplies a supplementary proof of the impossibility of attaining unto salvation by personal righteousness—a proof which converts his first statement concerning the general prevalence of sin into an absolutely universal doctrine as to the sinfulness of man. This new proof starts from the universal prevalence of death, which is the wages of sin. All men die because all men are sinners. But if so, men must have sinned before the giving of the law. But how could that be if where there is no law there is no transgression, and if by the law comes the knowledge of sin? The answer to this question Paul finds in the great principle of solidarity, or the moral unity of mankind. The first man sinned, and that is enough. By one man sin entered into the world, and death followed in its track legitimately, righteously, because when one man sinned all sinned. Such I take to be the meaning of the famous text Romans 5:12. The rendering of the Vulgate, *in quo omnes peccaverunt*, is grammatically wrong but essentially right. The common interpretation, that death passed upon all men because all men *personally* sinned, is not true to the fact. For those who die in infancy have not so sinned.

In the famous comparison between Adam and Christ sin and righteousness are conceived of *objectively* as two great antagonistic forces fighting against each other, not so much *in* man as *over* him, the one manifesting itself in

death, the other in life. From the day that Adam sinned sin showed the reality of its power by the death which overtook successive generations of mankind. The existence of an Adam through whom the race was condemned made it necessary that there should appear a second Adam, in whose righteousness it might be righteous. The objection that it is unjust and unreasonable that one man should suffer for another man's sins must not be pressed, for modern science, by its doctrine of heredity, has made it more manifest than ever that the solidarity of mankind is a great fact and not merely a theological theory, and that the only question is as to the best way of stating it so as to conserve all moral interests.

(3) It must be shown, furthermore, that sin is a power in man as well as above him. This demonstration the apostle supplies in his statement as to the sinful proclivity of the flesh, Romans, ch. 7. It takes the form of a personal confession. "I am carnal, sold under sin, for what I do I know not; for not what I wish to do, but what I hate, this I do." Personal in form, the confession is really the confession of humanity. The ego that speaks is that of the human race. It is not St. Paul's flesh that is at fault, it is *the* flesh, the flesh which all men wear, the flesh in which dwells sin. Of the origin of this bias in the flesh toward evil he gives no account. The nearest hint to an answer is to be found in the terms in which, in 1 Cor. 15, the first man is described as in contrast to the second, only a living soul, psychical as distinct from spiritual, and of the earth, earthy. These expressions seem to point in the direction of a nature not very different from our own, and altogether suggest an idea of the primitive state of man not quite answering to the theological conception of original righteousness.

(4) The last particular in the Pauline doctrine of sin is the statement concerning the effect of the law's action on the sinful proclivity of the flesh. On this point the apostle teaches that in consequence of the evil bias of the flesh, the law, so far from being the way to righteousness, is rather simply a source of the knowledge of sin, and an irritant to sin. This topic is handled chiefly in Romans 7:7, seq. The law must have been instituted, therefore, with reference to an ulterior system which should be able to realize the legally impossible, and intended to be superseded when it had served its purpose. This purpose was to prepare for the advent of the Son of God, who, coming in the likeness of sinful flesh, and with reference to sin, should condemn sin in the flesh, and help believers in him to be indeed sons of God. The law, however, does more than bring to consciousness human depravity. In doing that it at the same time makes man aware that there is more in him than sin,—an inner man in a state of protest against the deeds of the outer man. This duality is at once my misery and my hope: my misery, for it is wretched to be drawn two ways; my hope, for I ever feel that my flesh and my sin, though mine, are not myself. This feeling all may share. On the bright hopeful side, as well as on the darker, St. Paul is the spokesman for the race.

The foregoing series of articles accentuates the value of a scientific biblical theology in the interpretation of Scripture. Had the writings of Paul been studied as a whole, and for the purpose of ascertaining what they really teach, he could not have been held responsible for so many unreasonable doctrines which an *a priori* theology and an uncompromising logic have deduced from him. Fairly and self-consistently interpreted he preaches a gospel as broad and sympathetic as that of Christ himself.

P. A. N.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF EZRA II. AND IV. 6-23. I. By the RIGHT REV. LORD ARTHUR C. HERVEY, D.D., Bishop of Bath and Wells, in *The Expositor* for June, 1893. Pages 431-443.

The difficulty in Ezra 2 arises from the fact that this chapter is a duplicate of Neh. 7. Are the two passages identical in the sense that they are borrowed one from the other? If so, which chapter is the original and which is transcribed from the other? By a comparison of the two accounts of the offerings for the temple service in Ezra 2:68-69, and Neh. 7:70-72, some interesting discoveries are made. Evidently there are several words lost and evidences of text corruption, especially in the numbers. The difference in the proper names in the two are probably due to clerical carelessness. Everything goes to prove that the original document belongs to Nehemiah. (1) He tells us in Chap. 7:5-6 on what occasion he found and used this document. By verses 6-60 the claims of all who came up "to be reckoned by genealogies" were tried. A few presented themselves who could not prove their claims to a place in Zerubbabel's register, and so were omitted from Nehemiah's roll. Some were also found who claimed to be priests who could produce no register of their genealogy, and were set aside until the high priest by the Urim and Thummim decided regarding their claims to the priesthood. All this is manifestly no part of Zerubbabel's register, but a record of what happened in pursuance of Nehemiah's project in verse 5.

(2) Neh. 7:66-69 contains what is still more conclusive. The number in verse 66 f. is not the total in Zerubbabel's list, but the total of those whom Nehemiah "gathered together to reckon by genealogies." This is indicated by the obvious probability of the case, by the discrepancy of the numbers, and by the place in the narrative where the enumeration comes in at an interval of four verses after the close of the list, and by the use of the word *haq-qa-hal* congregation (verse 66). The difference between the sum total of 42,360 and the total of the items, 30,000, represents the increase in the population during the years which had elapsed since Zerubbabel's census was taken. (3) Again, Ezra 2:68, "house of the Lord," clearly implies that the "house of the Lord"—not standing in the reign of Cyrus—was now one of the buildings of the city. (4) The crowning evidence is the mention of "Tirshatha," who was certainly Nehemiah himself (*cf.* chap. 8:9). If this is Nehemiah, can it be any one else in Ezra, 2:63? If Ezra 2 treats of

Nehemiah how can it be a part of the history of the times of Zerubbabel and Cyrus?

Nehemiah then is the original text, and Ezra 2 was an insertion of a later redactor from this document.

This is not so satisfactory or conclusive a discussion as we could wish of this troublesome chronological snarl. Bishop Hervey is quite too dogmatic in his assertions of certain results. When the second part appears we may have some additional light on his method of solution.

PRICE.

ARE THERE METRES IN OLD TESTAMENT POETRY? ANCIENT STATEMENTS AND MODERN THEORIES. By PROFESSOR EDWIN CONE BISSELL, D.D., in *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for July, 1893. Pages 440-449.

Philo and Josephus were the pioneers in the view that the poetry of the Old Testament was metrical in form. The church fathers largely sympathized with them and gave currency to the same opinions. It now seems that those pioneers intentionally misrepresented the facts in order to put Hebrew poetry on a par with Greek. Early in the seventeenth century a Dutch professor at Groningen became the leading adventurer of modern explorers in this line. He found as a result of his principles that Hebrew verse is like that of Latin and Greek, only that *each verse has its own kind*. The wits of his day said of his scheme: "*Gomari lyram delirare*." The eighteenth century records the vain delusions of such metre-finders as Jones, Greve, Bishop Hare, Weisse, Drechsler, Lautwein, and Anton. Early in this century appeared several new *patent-applied-for* schemes in explaining the venerable poetry of Israel, such as Bellerman and Saalschütz. The last half of this century also has its roster of metrical *prospectors*. Among them may be named Meier, Peters, Ley, Bickell, Briggs, and Ball. Everything of metre in Hebrew poetry thus far advocated submits the text to unwarrantable emendations, interpolations, and literary violence. Metre in Hebrew poetry is little less than an *ignis fatuus*.

PRICE.

OLD WINE IN FRESH WINE SKINS. By PROFESSOR HOWARD OSGOOD, D.D., in *Bibliotheca Sacra* for July, 1893. Pages 460-486.

The old wine of biblical criticism is presented to the consumer in such fresh wine skins as Driver's "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament" and in Cornill's "Einleitung in das Alte Testament." Both scholars represent the same school of criticism, and are among the leading critics in England and Germany respectively. For comprehensive grasp of the situation and full facing of the sea the German is the captain on the bridge. He is entirely at ease on his vessel in the sea of criticism. The Englishman, on the other hand, has scarcely become *sea-mated* on these waters. It takes him

one-third longer to make the same trip, because all the way he tries to keep in sight of land without wrecking on the rocks. He uses the Kuenen compass, but for the sake of his passengers keeps within sighting range of the shore.

These works are marvellously faithful reprints of the critical views of Hermann Samuel Reimarus, author of "The Apology or Defence of the Rational Worshippers of God," which appeared in Hamburg in 1767. With a little shading here or lightening there, not only Cornill and Driver, but all such uniformed and skilled operators have used the same critical negatives. Higher criticism is neither new nor modern. Its germ dates from the second, its evolution and development from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Voltaire and the deistic Frederick II. of Prussia were among its most vigorous promoters about the middle of the eighteenth century. Kuenen, of our own century, himself a deist, held practically the old ground. He rejected the supernatural, the miraculous, and immediate revelation. Consistently, too, he maintained his ground. But this jewel is rarely found among his professed followers outside of the continent of Europe.

But this school of criticism, the world around, is cloistered. As if behind convent walls, shut off from the news of the past, it pores over its musty manuscripts, framing rules for detecting documents, devising dates, discussing development in the literary and religious history of Israel. But outside of their thick-walled, narrow-windowed confines there is bright light. This last half of the nineteenth century has produced arc-lights for the critic. The dynamos are located on the Nile and in the Mesopotamian valley. Only those who stay behind their adamantine walls of prejudice and cover their windows with the blinds of a false logic entirely ignore these new helps. Literature and history are all ablaze with this light. Civilization was old before Moses day. Language and religion were existent in remarkably perfect forms one thousand years before Israel's sojourn in Egypt. Southwestern Asia and Egypt were occupied at least two thousand years B. C. by peoples who had reached maturity in many respects in the chief elements of civilization. These facts are unchallenged by the best archæological scholarship of this day. How, then, can critics of recognized ability in other respects silently ignore this line of research? It simply cannot be done. This new-old history will compel recognition, particularly by men who claim to be historical critics. These facts once acknowledged and accepted, the foundation theories of these introductions are swept away as with a flood. Israel was not so far beneath its neighbors in language, religion, morals, and care for their sacred records. They were Semites, and among the best and brightest of them. Why then should they be, as these introductions make them appear, thousands of years behind the other Semitic peoples? These works imagine a state of society and religion before the age of David in blank contradiction to the facts revealed by the monuments. This purely imaginary society and religion give their theory its basis. "If these results of Egyptology and Assyriology are true,

then there is far greater reason for placing the composition of the Pentateuch in the classic age than in the age of the decline and abasement of Western Asiatic and Egyptian literature." Again, the New Testament is shut out of the race by Driver's preface as incompetent. How "strange to read eight hundred pages of criticism of the Old Testament by two Christian theological professors and never meet once with a mention of Christ or of the Holy Spirit or of the witness of the New Testament!" Kuenen cast the die for this stamp when he said, "We must either cast aside as worthless our dearly-bought scientific method, or must forever cease to acknowledge the authority of the New Testament *in the domain of the exegesis of the Old*. Without hesitation we choose the latter alternative" (Prophets, p. 448.)

But another and better school of criticism has arisen. It begins where the truest science begins, in the consciousness of each individual. Experimental religion, personal union with the Master, the aid of the Holy Spirit in the understanding of the Word, promise still more lasting and eternal conquests for the Bible and the Church.

Dr. Osgood insists on a broader study of criticism. To weigh correctly its results necessitates a careful examination of its history and of the latest discourses in the East. These points are essential and must be given due regard in the settlement of critical views.

PRICE.